Using extended metaphor to induce the production of figurative language in low-intermediate Japanese learner writing : A preliminary experiment

Using extended metaphor to induce the production of figurative language in low-intermediate Japanese learner writing: A preliminary experiment

Joseph Tomei

Abstract

This paper describes the initial part of a long term research project to investigate the teaching of metaphor to low-intermediate level Japanese university students, by first determining whether the presentation of one extended metaphor can induce composition students to recognize a second extended metaphor in two following writing prompts. Because this is a novel application of metaphor theory to L2 writing, a detailed background of metaphor in general and Conceptual Metaphor Theory in particular is provided, followed by an experiment designed to determine if, absent the explicit teaching of metaphor, it is possible to induce the production of metaphor in L2 learners through the presentation of multimodal writing prompts, specifically music videos. Quantitative and qualitative analyses of this experiment are presented, followed by a conclusion.

1. Introduction

This paper describes the first part of an exploratory research project to investigate the teaching of metaphor to low-intermediate level Japanese university students, specifically, to determine if the presentation of one extended metaphor can induce composition students to recognize a second extended metaphor in two following writing prompts. Overall, this paper seeks to apply the insights of cognitive linguistics, specifically metaphor research, to develop alternative ways of teaching composition to non-native

language learners. The first part of this research project consists of asking students to write a self introduction either as a standard essay (the control condition) or in the form of an extended metaphor (specifically LIFE IS A JOURNEY, the experimental condition), presents two music videos as writing prompts that incorporate the extended metaphor of LIFE IS A STAGE in order to draw conclusions about the presentation and production of metaphor.

In any discussion of L2 acquisition, it is useful to contrast the difference between the question of L1 acquisition, often referred to as the 'poverty of stimulus argument' (however, see Pullum and Scholz (2002) for some necessary skepticism about that) which can be stated as '*how do all humans learn their first language in the absence of any explicit teaching?*' and the question of L2 acquisition, which can be stated as '*why can the adult L2 learner cannot access the information that informs their L1 in course of learning a second language?*' Modern metaphor research suggests that the answer to the first question can be found through Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT), a framework that argues that some of the structures of human language develop from physical interactions with the world, which are acquired by children as they are learning the language, explaining why children can 'know' so much. This sharpens the question of why it is that L2 learners (as opposed to learners in a bilingual acquisition situation) are unable to access this information. In the next section, I give a background to CMT in order to identify why it may be of interest in research into L2 learning. Given the growing body of research on how conceptual structure shapes both our understanding and production of language, the aim of this study is to take these insights and find ways to apply them to writing pedagogy.

2.0 Conceptual Metaphor Theory

2.1 A General View of Metaphor

Metaphor was first discussed by Aristotle and has long been taken as a domain of philosophy. This is in large part because the fact that metaphor is traditionally defined a word or phrase used to describe something contrary to truth conditions (so 'Juliet is the sun' is defined as a metaphor because both the speaker and the listener realize that Juliet is not the sun) made it a paradox and so was felt to be something different than the 'ordinary' use of language, However, research into metaphor suggests that this division between 'literal' and 'figurative' is an artificial one and fails to capture a number of commonalities between literal and figurative language as well as failing to identify what makes metaphor unique.

It should also come as no surprise that traditional discussion of metaphor was restricted to the native speaker. When a native speaker coins a new metaphor, it is creativity, but when the adult language learner coins one, it is a mistake. A further consideration is that in the skills of writing and reading that are not as time sensitive as listening and speaking, the way the language learner understands and organizes his or her ideas can allow the learner to make up for knowledge and strengths that the native speaker may possess. It is important to remember that while the acquisition of speaking and listening fluency in a first language is, in all but the most extreme cases, a given, the acquisition of literacy and the ability to compose longer forms is not. Aristotle's examples were primarily drawn from Homeric epics, certainly *sine qua non* in terms of constructed and refined composition.

2.2 The beginnings of Metaphor Research

From Aristotle's time, a huge body of literature from philosophy looked to examine and question Aristotle's conception of metaphor (cf. the first

chapter of Holme (2004) for a useful review), but it is only in the past few decades that metaphor was seen to be integral to how we understand and communicate about reality rather than a separate, decorative aspect of language. Providing an exact point in time when this change of direction occurred is probably impossible, but a useful starting point would be a conference held in 1977 organized by Andrew Ortony which brought together not only philosophers, but psychologists and linguists and other researchers to discuss notions of metaphor and provides a useful starting point. The collected papers became a volume called *Metaphor and Thought* (Ortony, 1979, with a second revised edition issued in 1993) and the papers represent the beginning for many aspects of research into metaphor. One particular article, acknowledged by George Lakoff as a foundational text, was Michael Reddy's (1979) paper entitled "The Conduit Metaphor" .

In this paper, Reddy argued that the metaphor of a "conduit" shapes and controls some of the ways we talk about language and communication. Some of the many examples he gave include:

・'get one's thoughts across'
・'words carry meaning'
・'that paper is empty of meaning'

What Reddy observed was that this metaphor, when applied to a situation of communication, shapes the understanding and perception of the situation in ways that are generally unnoticed by both the speaker and the listener and are not limited to a discrete set of lexical items, but encompass a wide range of concepts that be explained in reference to an underlying metaphor. By choosing language as the entity discussed and providing a detailed list of phrases and usages (albeit in English), he clearly presented how the main concern of linguist, answering the

question ‘what is language?’, was shaped by this metaphor of a conduit. This brought home to linguists the fact that a metaphor was not simply the application of a specific word, phrase or idea to describe a non-similar item, but actually a larger concept that continues shapes our understanding of what it means to communicate.

While Reddy used the term ‘metaphor’, other researchers, seeking to emphasize that what is being invoked is a complex body of knowledge as well as seeking to propose larger cognitive mechanisms for this process, have used terms like ‘frame’ (Fillmore, 1982), ‘cognitive domain’ (Langacker, 1987), ‘conceptual metaphor’ (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980) and ‘idealized cognitive model’ or ‘ICM’ (Lakoff, 1987). All of these mechanisms should be seen as proposed building blocks for describing how native speakers use language.

It was Reddy’s paper that Lakoff, who participated in the 1977 conference, citeds as instrumental in developing his own notions of metaphor in the second edition of the text, leading him to write, with Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (1980). As the title suggests, Lakoff and Johnson posited a range of metaphors that shape our understanding and ultimately our perceptions. This theory has evolved into the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT), which continues to represent one major thread of metaphor research. While there are other competing theories of metaphor, for the purpose of this research project, I will rely on many of the insights of CMT.

2.3 Conceptual Metaphor Theory

A first pass at describing CMT is that basic metaphors are acquired early in life, often as part of our cultural and linguistic heritage, and these form the basis for many of our notions about the world. These basic metaphors are then mapped onto new domains. As an example, a

major group of metaphors are based on observations about the physical world, so, for example, UP IS GOOD is said to be derived from the fact that an accumulation of material is necessarily going to create a taller configuration, which is an understanding that all humans take on board.

Some have pointed to the presence of counter examples to the notion of UP IS GOOD, such as ‘inflation is up’ or ‘the murder rate is climbing’ constitute an argument against CMT. However, Lakoff and Johnson argue that while metaphors do shape our perceptions, we find that metaphors are employed to represent opposing ideas. It is useful to return to another paper in the previously mentioned Ortony collection, by Donald Schon, which had the title of “Generative Metaphor: A perspective on problem setting in social policy”. (Schon, 1979/1993) The title invokes Generative Semantics and Schon points out that metaphors can both ‘generate’ ideas and cause ideas to be ignored. His example is something that, at first glance, appears not to be a very linguistically focused topic: the challenges of urban housing and communities. Schon notes that there were two metaphors that are often used in discussing approaches to urban housing, a particularly heated topic in the 70’s, with the first one being ‘renewal’ and the second one being ‘blight’.

For the word “renewal” , he says we can imagine that the communities are ‘natural’, and if they are challenged or problematic, they need to be improved through rebuilding and new growth. The image that Schon suggests is operative is a new plant, starting to grow. However, Schon notes that another word was often used: ‘blight’, which means a disease that causes a plant to die. Keeping with that idea, the notion is to remove or cut off the part that is ‘blighted’, so when this is applied to urban situations, the focus is on removing the diseased parts of the community. Schon points out that despite the fact that both metaphors are based on a metaphor of problems

with urban housing as being equivalent to a living organism, these two ideas or frames conflict with each other and suggest that this is why two people viewing the same objective proposal may have very different reactions to it.

Lakoff and Johnson (1999) term this ability to have two different frames as 'duality' and suggest that even basic conceptual metaphors have this ability, thus addressing the criticism that the use of the construct 'up' is not limited to notions that are good or pleasing. Using the example of metaphors for time, they note that one can talk about time in two metaphors. The first, that of 'Moving Time', is expressed in phrases like 'Christmas is coming', while the second can be expressed using the same verb as 'We are coming up on Christmas'. While these two metaphors are inconsistent with each other, they represent a reversal of the Figure and Ground, concepts grounded in our perceptual capabilities. In the example of 'Christmas is coming', the event Christmas is the figure, which we render as the subject and take the image of the event coming towards our location, while the second example of 'We are coming up on Christmas', the subject 'we' is perceived as moving towards the event. Both of these metaphors embody a more basic notion, that of TIME IS MOTION (Lakoff and Johnson, 1999:52).

While our interactions with the world create one set of conceptual metaphors, another set can be seen as being based in our reactions to the world. Thus, languages and cultures tend to describe anger in terms of heat because it basically mirrors the fact that anger creates a particular bodily response that can be metaphorically described (following the conventions of CMT) as ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER (Lakoff & Kövecses, 1987). While the original paper presented examples from American English, similar patterning has been found in Chinese, Japanese and Hungarian (Kövecses, 1990, 2000; Yu, 1998).

CMT argument, then, is in some senses encapsulated in a line attributed to the Greek philosopher, Protagoras, ‘Man is the measure of all things’, in that it is the fundamental relationships between human beings and their environment that shapes language and because these are shared at a basic level by all humans, this is taken to explain shared cognitive patterns and therefore accounts for similarities in patterns of thinking as well as in language and culture.

2.4. Metaphors: Attributional, Analogical and Complex

Lakoff and Johnson’s notion of a conceptual metaphor is quite different from the traditional definition of a metaphor as “NOUN1 is NOUN2” , limited to a phrase or sentence. In Gentner, Falkenhainer, and Skorstad (1987), they suggest 3 categories, attributional metaphors, relational metaphors, and complex metaphors. Attributional metaphors would be ones such as ‘Achilles is a lion’, where particular entity (in this case Achilles, traditionally named the tenor) is taken to ‘borrow’ attributes from the second noun (in this case, a lion, traditionally named the vehicle) (cf. Richards, 1936), which has formed the basis for traditional discussions of metaphor.

On the other hand, a relational metaphor is more similar to Lakoff and Johnson’s conceptual metaphor, and Gentner et. al suggest that such a metaphor maps one structure to another, so that it is the relationship in one domain that are being used to describe relationships in another. Their purpose is to create a way of identifying and classifying metaphors, so their third category, typified by an example from e.e.cummings poem *somewhere i have never travelled,gladly beyond*, which has the line “the voice of your eyes is deeper than all roses”, is defined as a complex metaphor and is one that is essentially argued to be unidentifiable using an algorithm. CMT would classify attributional metaphors as simply instantiations of

conceptual (i.e. relational) metaphors and complex metaphors as literary devices that could be broken down into conceptual metaphors. So, the e.e. cummings quote might be described as a combination of SENSE ORGANS ARE COMMUNICATION DEVICES (with the notion that the 'eyes' are conveying information) and DEPTH IS MORE INFORMATION (which then transfers the notion of space to the notion of color as an example of cross-modal synesthesia, where a 'deep red' carries more weight and therefore presumed to carry more information than a lighter shade). It is useful to note that while cummings' juxtaposition of these ideas is striking, they rely on everyday phrases that any native speaker has come into contact with ('your eyes are telling me you don't want to go'; 'His knowledge of the subject was profound') as well as a synthesiastic relationship.

As an illustration of how an attributional metaphor cannot convey a systematic relationship, we can see that while Reddy's observation can be summarized as 'Language is a conduit', we also realize that this does not get across the full range of meanings and connections that Reddy wants to highlight. Thus, Reddy's argument is an example of Gentner et al's relational metaphor, which can be contrasted with the notion of an attributional, or traditional metaphor. Models which concentrate on accounting for attributional metaphor often focus on which attributes are chosen and how they can be linked between the topic and the vehicle. On the other hand, relational metaphors are argued to be best dealt with by a structure mapping approach. While Gentner's relational metaphor and Lakoff's conceptual metaphor differ in scope, the underlying notion is the same, which is that these metaphors provide a structural scaffold that can be accessed.

Furthermore, verbs and adjectives have rarely been classed as metaphors, even though they clearly invoke particular images in order

to get across their meaning. For example, one may say ‘the airport is socked in’, clearly invoking the notion of being able to enter, but not being able to continue on. Another example would be ‘I’m tied up until lunch’, emphasizing that the person has other obligations that cannot be ignored or postponed. For adjectives, we can speak of ‘foggy thinking’, or, ‘incendiary language’. These are not traditionally classified as metaphor because it is assumed that the lexical definitions can be expanded to cover these concepts. However, for pedagogical purposes, this paper will argue that presenting and encouraging learners to understand these phenomena not as lexical in nature, but rooted in metaphor is a valid and more effective approach, especially in the area of writing.

2.5 Metaphors as linguistic evidence versus evidence of concepts

The previous discussion of metaphors concentrated on phrasal and sentential metaphors, and CMT could originally be described as a linguistic approach, seeking to explain the distribution of linguistic data by native speakers. However, it was soon expanded to be a conceptual approach, seeking to explain how people form and utilize concepts. This idea is embedded in Lakoff and Johnson’s Embodied Mind theory (1999), which argues that our initial relationships with the world, particularly how we physically relate to the objects and our environment, not only form a foundation for language but also for thought, thus providing an apparent ‘universality’ to language systems and thought processes across cultures. Taking our previous example, we relate the emotion of anger to increased heat and pressure within a small space, in part because of physiological changes we undergo when we experience the emotion of anger, which, along with a possibly universal image of humans as containers, accounts for the similarity in expressions across cultures, (Kövecses, 2000) giving us

phrases such as

・I thought he was going to explode

・He's just blowing off steam

・He was boiling mad

Thus, some metaphors are constrained in terms of our shared human heritage, explaining why we find commonalities in cultures in relation to many human emotions and other basic aspects.

As a theory of concepts, CMT proposes that all humans employ this framework, which begs the question: if all humans use this, why are these insights about language not harnessed by the L2 learner? Research of this question is rooted in the concepts of automaticity and routinization, so just as it is difficult to imagine how to consciously explain how to walk or breath to an entity to whom the notions are foreign, so too is it difficult to explain distribution of prepositions such as *in*, *on* and *at*, even though it is posited that the distribution is controlled by conceptual metaphors of location. Because there is no clear dividing line between our conceptual metaphors of space and time as opposed to our conceptual metaphors for more culturally based activities, the L2 learner is not only unable to access these conceptual metaphors in an amount of time that would permit fluent production similar to a native speaker without large amounts of practice. With this, the pedagogical challenge of what we teach to the learner is brought into focus.

Another example from Lakoff and Johnson serves to highlight this pedagogical challenge. One of the most famous examples in Lakoff and Johnson's work is the claim that the image of arguing and argumentation is Western culture and especially English is based on a conceptual metaphor of ARGUMENT IS WAR. Their data are sentence like these:

・Your claims are indefensible.

・He attacked every weak point in my argument.
・His criticisms were right on target.
・I demolished his argument.
・I've never won an argument with him.
・You disagree? Okay, shoot!
・If you use that strategy, he'll wipe you out.
・He shot down all of my arguments.

Because this is a much more expansive definition of metaphor, rather than using the traditional terms mentioned earlier of *tenor* and *vehicle*, the first term, ARGUMENT, is labeled the *target domain*, while the second term, WAR, is referred to as the *source domain*. Following Reddy, Lakoff and Johnson argue that the relationships within the source domain are often inferred to the target domain. This is an expansion of the traditional notion of metaphor and follows Cameron and Stelma (2007) in their definition of 'metaphor' as including "similes, analogies and hyperbole" under particular circumstances which are when two separate domains are brought together. This can help explain why words and phrases like 'shot down', 'attacked' and 'strategy' are used here, even though the word 'war' is never mentioned, because they can be considered to be part of the domain of WAR. Because of this, they are readily accepted when there is domain to domain mapping. Bringing these examples in also serves to illustrate the systematicity of domain to domain mapping.

However, even though there is this mapping, this still remains ambiguous, because not all relationships are transferred. We know that when we have an argument, we don't join the army, we don't send soldiers, but how do native speakers know that certain phrases are sanctioned but others are not? To deal with that question, the claim is

refined to the notion that while we do utilize parts of the target domain and the structure of that domain to think, discuss and act on arguments, we do not use the whole domain. This means that the process is selective, and the native speaker, because of exposure to the language, is able to select the features of the domain that highlight the relationship s/he wants to convey. However, for the L2 learner, it is arguably necessary to teach those features or at least expose the learner to input that identifies the portions of the domain that can be transferred.

CMT also argues that the way the conceptual metaphor is mapped is unidirectional, from source domain to target domain, which means that it only goes from WAR to ARGUMENT, not the other way around. Because of this, Lakoff and Johnson claim that is why we don't have just one conceptual metaphor to think about argument, we can use several different ones, such as ARGUMENT IS SPORT or ARGUMENT IS A DANCE.

As CMT was initially a linguistic approach, it is no surprise that it retains aspects of that approach. Just as a linguistic theory argues that the simplest solution is the best, the same is true in CMT, and if a conceptual metaphor can be broken into smaller components, it is taken to be more correct to describe it in terms of those smaller components. For example, Lakoff and Johnson propose the conceptual metaphor THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS, presenting evidence such as

・That theory lacks a firm foundation.

・The theory crumbled under the weight of questions.

However, Grady (1997) argues that Lakoff and Johnson's proposed conceptual metaphor is overdetermined by pointing to examples such as:

・*That theory has French windows.

・*The theory needs plumbing.

This leads Grady to suggest that the conceptual metaphor THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS can be better be described as a ‘compound’ metaphor consisting of two more basic conceptual metaphors, what he terms as ‘primary metaphors’, ORGANIZATION IS PHYSICAL STRUCTURE and PERSISTING IS REMAINING STANDING. These two primary metaphors are argued to be the preferred explanation because as a linguistic approach, the description that provides the component parts at the lowest level is preferred on grounds of simplicity and systematicity.

This claim for simplicity and systematicity needs to be reviewed critically in regard to second language acquisition. Blank (1988) argues that experimental results show that for native speakers, metaphors can be divided into two categories, “familiar metaphors”, which are processed as quickly as literal speech, and “fairly familiar metaphors”, which are processed at a slightly slower speed. While this may be indicative of the native speaker’s ability, it does not follow that the second language learner acquires the same ability in the same fashion. In fact, research suggests that second language learners bring different strategies to bear on metaphor processing (Littlemore, 2001), so presumptions that second language learners’ use of metaphor mirrors that of native speakers may be misguided. This suggests that for the pedagogic use of metaphor awareness, it is not necessarily true that the simplest explanation is the most preferable.

Gerrig and Gibbs (1988) point to the fact that ‘there is a striking imbalance between the unlimited number of ideas speakers may wish to express and the limited number of conventional meanings a community may hold in common’ (p. 1) which suggests that the native speaker, rather than having a number of small building blocks to construct virtually anything, only has larger structures that can produce a more limited selection. What is

true for the native speaker applies even more strongly to the student of English who is seeking to acquire those limited meanings. Imagine, for a moment, the diligent language teacher seeking to identify and teach all of the metaphorical possibilities, or even, for that matter, teaching carefully chosen ideal exemplars of the range of a particular metaphor or metaphors, carefully determined so as to provide coverage for all or at least a large part of the expressions that comprise of the totality of the metaphorical possibilities. While the teacher may be successful in conveying the essence of the particular metaphors chosen, it is not clear how the students would identify and learn other metaphors that were used but not taught. On the other hand, imagine the same diligent teacher carefully identifying the building blocks for higher level conceptual metaphors and teaching those. It is not clear if the student would necessarily be able to apply these building blocks in order to acquire a sufficient range of expressions. So, for second language learners, there is a balance that is required between a maximally diverse set of phrases and meanings and a minimally adequate range of principles, which is why this project seeks to aim at that middle area.

Because this project will seek to have students organize their longer form writing through the conscious application of conceptual metaphor, the term I will use is ‘extended metaphor’, following Musolff (2004, 2006, 2012). Extended metaphor attempts to suggest a comparison to a second domain that is used as an organizing principle for constructing a longer form piece of writing rather than a conceptual metaphor that may or may not be held by the student. This can be contrasted with the term ‘recurrent metaphor’ (cf. Low, 2008), which suggests that the metaphor is not a conscious strategy, but representative of the subconscious use of metaphor. Low examined academic book reviews written by native speakers of English, while I will

be working with non-native speakers producing short essays, so while these two terms are identifying the same phenomenon, because 'recurrent' deals with how we understand a particular text, I will use 'extended' to emphasize how a particular text is produced.

2.6 The trajectory of metaphor research and the data used

CMT draws on a number of features of cognitive linguistics and can be considered part of that larger movement. Generative semantics, which is generally recognized as the predecessor of cognitive linguistics, provided a template for the way linguistic research was conducted, and it can be said that CMT shares not only similar research aims and goals, but also has proceeded on a similar track, a track that helps us understand the trajectory of metaphor research and the threads of metaphor research that this project will draw on.

Like generative semantics, the 'data' that CMT researchers initially utilized were created examples, generally unsourced, and presented in a way that appealed to the linguistic intuitions of a native speaker. This serves to maintain the primacy of the native speaker as the determining judge in what was 'correct' and what was 'incorrect'. This relationship between the native speaker's intuitions and the metaphorical output of non-native speakers can be seen in Nacey (2012) which compares the written metaphorical production of Norwegian L2 students and British A-level students, finding that the Norwegian students produce more novel metaphors than their British counterparts. These metaphors, because they are not produced by native speakers, might be judged as ungrammatical or ill formed. This leads to a situation where the implementation of a standard that is too strict leads to a dismissing of the 'novel' metaphors of the non-native speaker and giving primacy to the native speaker, despite the fact

that metaphors may be perfectly understandable. For example, MacArthur (2010), in discussing the notion of metaphorical competence in L2 learners, cites the example of a student's use of 'bumped into' in the phrase 'I bumped into a poster'. MacArthur argues that this usage is awkward because while 'bumped into' can describe a chance encounter, the object of 'bumped into' is generally taken to be animate, so she adduces that the writer must be mistaken because this is only correct if 'the writer means that he literally collided with the object' (p. 164). MacArthur continues:

> This kind of problem with target language metaphors is far from infrequent and shows that learners have not engaged with the basic sense of the words that make up this expression and which motivate its collocational patterns. This learner knows that bump into is a way of talking about chance encounters and in a bilingual dictionary will find that it is offered as a possible translation of '*encontrarse con*' along with come across or meet but none of these expressions are truly synonymous. (p. 165)

Yet notice these examples, culled from the internet, that have writers bumping into inanimate nouns.

- This strategy may keep you from being bumped into a higher tax bracket
- Kathe Kollwitz bumped into a parade up Prenzlauer.
- Sometimes, when you're traveling around in cyberspace, you bump into a Web site that has a whole bunch of information on it or a collection of things to do on the site.
- Sanda Erdelez has investigated people 'bumping into' information: what she calls 'information encountering'...
- People often bump into new information or new sources of

information unintentionally through “leaky...quasi social networks”

・As campaigns increase in their intensity, voters have greater opportunities to bump into campaign information.

All the examples suggest that ‘bump’ does not need an animate recipient, and the last three examples underline the characteristic that the object is some sort of unexpected information. Again, when the native speaker uses it, it is creative, when the L2 learner uses it, it is taken as an error. The use of ‘bumped into’ may not totally felicitous, but it can serve to help convey the surprise and serendipity of the encounter.

Another example can be found in Kathpalia & Carmel (2011). In analyzing student essays assigned to prepare them for the production of an essay written to support a scholarship application, they point to one student’s essay where s/he writes: “It’s about strong networks here in NTU. Someone’s always got your back” and they observe that “Get off someone’s back is often used negatively when you want someone to stop criticizing or pressurizing you. It therefore contradicts the main proposition rather than reinforcing it in this context.” (p. 285) Unfortunately, ‘to have someone’s back’ is a perfectly acceptable phrase, with this definition, from http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=have+my+back supporting its use:

To have one’s back is to protect one from unanticipated matters, while one is attending to a particular function.

A final example serves to illustrate the potential of student centered consideration of metaphor. MacArthur (ibid) observes the following:

One learner, when asked why he had correctly guessed that ‘shoulder’ was the most appropriate verb in one sentence, replied that, for him, the clue had been the subject of the clause (‘he’) because ‘to shoulder’ was a very masculine action. [...] The two researchers, both native

> speakers of English, were somewhat surprised by this reasoning, although this student's intuitions seemed perfectly plausible. In fact, a quick look at corpus lines in the BNC for 'shouldered' rapidly confirmed his reasoning, as masculine subjects were found to be overwhelmingly preferred in the recorded instances of the use of this verb. *This learner's intuitive understanding of the verbal use of 'shoulder' was more insightful than his teachers*'. (p. 167, emph mine)

Kathpalia & Carmel (ibid) point to the benefits derived by using metaphor, but add the emphasis of "especially those with intermediate to advanced proficiency in the target language". MacArthur's 2010 article discusses work with Spanish students at CEFR B2 level, which is described as learners who can "Can produce clear, detailed text on a wide range of subjects and explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various options." This study deals with students who are A2 ("can describe in simple terms aspects of his/her background, immediate environment and matters in areas of immediate need") or, at best, B1 ("can describe experiences and events, dreams, hopes and ambitions and briefly give reasons and explanations for opinions and plans") on the CEFR, a point below advanced or even intermediate proficiency, with the presumption that even lower level learners will benefit from exposure to conceptual metaphors.

As this project deals with Japanese L2 students who are at a much lower level of proficiency, the goal is to increase the production of metaphorical language within their compositions because presumably, increasing the production of metaphorical language, especially novel metaphorical language, is an important step in increased writing ability.

Data generated by the linguist in order to make his or her point suffers

from the potential of a selection bias, in that the researcher only chooses the points that seem salient and fails to notice or take into account other data. In order to address this fundamental problem, many researchers turned to corpora in order to determine overall tendencies and ground the analysis in something other than speaker intuition. For example, Deignan utilizes a corpus to examine collocations with the semantic item (2003) and notes that cultural/historical information is 'stored' within native speaker usages such as 'a one horse town' or 'get on one's high horse'. While speakers may not conscious of the fact that the usage of the semantic item in metaphorical contexts tends to mirror cultural influences, corpus data can bring these intuitions to the fore and provide an analysis that is data-based. However, in this approach, the researcher still has to identify what they feel is important.

Because selection bias is still possible, some researchers have worked towards developing techniques to identify metaphor that do not depend on the researcher's intuitions, but provide a series of steps. The most rigorous one is the Metaphor Identification Protocol (MIP), (cf. Steen et al, 2010). In this approach, lexical items are compared with a dictionary entry and if the meaning of the lexical item is sufficiently distant from the core meaning, as identified by the dictionary ordering of definitions, it can be classified as metaphorical. This approach is basically substituting the insight of the dictionary complier for the researcher, allowing a valuable distance between the identification protocol and the researcher administering it. However, it is not clear if students learning English are acquiring the meanings in the same order that native speakers are. For this reason, I would argue that the MIP approach is not suitable for identifying metaphor for second language learners, at least in this project. This project will use Cameron's 1999 identification procedure, which utilizes perceived incongruity to determine

whether a metaphoric vehicle can be identified. Although this does not provide a complete separation between researcher intuition and the data that is sought, it does provide a certain distance to allow the results to be less influenced by selection bias.

2.7 Metaphor research and Kachru's circles

There have been many calls for understanding and expanding the teaching of metaphor to second language students and a general recognition of its value, (Holme, 2004; Littlemore 2010; Littlemore, 2012; Littlemore and Low, 2006) but there are important groupings within this literature that need to be pointed out and a brief review of this literature will serve to place this project in perspective. In this next section, utilizing Kachru's (1992) notions of inner, outer and expanding circles in describing World Englishes, I will discuss how metaphor research has been shaped by these three circles.

The vast majority of metaphor research in English has been done, for obvious reasons, on Kachru's 'inner circle' countries. These countries, (US, UK, and other traditional bases of English) are 'norm-providing', in that they establish generally agreed standards. A smaller number of studies have been conducted on Kachru's 'outer circle', countries where English is not the native tongue, but has an important historical role and is used as a language for wider communication and these have generally been to view the metaphors produced by those speakers. All of these studies have been descriptive, seeking to understand and explain how metaphor is used. One exception to this is Littlemore (2003), who worked with Bangladeshi civil servants seconded to the UK to try and understand why they were unable to understand 'inner circle' speakers, in this case, UK university lecturers.

On the other hand, metaphor research on second language learners takes place in Kachru's 'expanding circle', where English does not play a historical

or governmental role, but is studied for the purposes of international communication. However, the range of the levels of English and the number of countries and cultures results in the application of metaphor research that mirror older attitudes about metaphor, in that metaphor is presented to low proficiency students as a way to unify explanations of basic usage, while advanced proficiency students are presented metaphor as 'idiomatic English', a term which suggests that metaphors fall in the realm of idioms, i.e phrases and ideas that are opaque and can only be addressed by memorization. For example, Boers and Demecheleer (1998) suggest teaching prepositions, Boers (2000) proposes metaphor awareness as an additional channel for vocabulary acquisition, while Deignan, Gabrys and Solska (1997) dealing with advanced Polish learners of English suggest having them use discussion and comparison of metaphors in English and Polish to have them understand and produce metaphors. On the other hand, Boers, Eyckmans, and Stengers (2007), Dong (2004) and Kalyuga & Kalyuga (2008) suggest that teachers provide diachronic explanations to help students acquire and use metaphor, harkening back to the notion of metaphors as colorful idioms rather than as fundamental to language.

Given that most students, especially here in Japan, have no opportunity in their first 6 to 8 years study of English to be given an awareness of metaphor, rather than seek to present metaphor as it may have been presented in those earlier years, a possibly more efficient and more interesting way to present metaphor to these students would be through utilizing metaphor as an organizing device for writing, which is what this project will attempt.

2.8 Materials to induce figurative language: Multimodality

This project utilizes pop music videos as writing prompts, a use that is based on an approach called multimodality and this section will give

some brief background on this approach.

Multimodality is based on the previous argument that CMT is a theory of concepts rather than linguistics and multimodal researchers argue that if CMT is truly a theory of concepts, then the same notions that are seen in linguistic phenomenon can be seen in other 'modes' and the challenge of multimodal research is to develop a system to classify and identify similar metaphors. One useful definition of multimodality is "the use of several semiotic modes in the design of a semiotic product or event" (Kress and van Leeuwen in Jewitt: 2009) and semiotic modes, a notion drawn from Systemic Functional Linguistics, include visual and aural modes. While there are several theories of description that are proposed for various modes, with the most developed being the one set out by Kress and van Leeuwen in their work Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design (2000). While there is not space for a complete multimodal analysis of the music videos used as writing prompts, one of the larger aims of the project is to develop a system of multimodal analysis that is appropriate for pedagogical use of videos.

3.0 The study

This study can be divided into two parts. The initial quantitative study serves to verify that L2 students have access to conceptual metaphors and, in the absence of explicit presentation of metaphor, can produce metaphor in response to implicit clues. Obviously, if students are explicitly instructed in metaphor, it would be unsurprising if students were able to identify metaphor in writing prompts. So the purpose of this quantitative study is to establish that conceptual metaphors are accessible to these L2 students and that multimodal writing prompts can induce the production of metaphor.

3.1 Research Questions

The research questions for the full study are the following:

- How and to what extent does exposure to one conceptual metaphor increase awareness of other conceptual metaphors?
- How and to what extent does awareness of one conceptual metaphor increase the use of other conceptual metaphors in Japanese L2 learner writing?

To answer the first question, the project presented learners with an initial conceptual metaphor, LIFE IS A JOURNEY, as a writing prompt for an initial self introduction. This was followed by two writing prompts in the form of popular music videos that incorporate aspects of the LIFE IS A STAGE metaphor, and the students were asked to write an essays describing each song and video. First, a review of these conceptual metaphors will be given.

3.1.1 Conceptual Metaphor 1

The first conceptual metaphor, LIFE IS A JOURNEY, was presented to students within an example essay for their own self introductions and is one that has been investigated by a number of researchers. The metaphor can be tied to the extensive literature on the linguistic relationship between space and time (Evans, 2013 for a detailed review) and its ubiquity in human languages (see Haspelmath, 1997 for one example) suggests that it is a fundamental human inheritance, derived from the notion that humans must map the passage of time on to the conceptual domain of motion and travel. Talmy's work in identifying a PATH component in language (see Talmy, 2000) further underlines the universal nature to our experience of travelling. However, Lakoff and Johnson (1999) present the conceptual metaphor as A PURPOSEFUL LIFE IS A JOURNEY and the key point their presentation concentrates on is the presence of a goal. This seems to be

overdetermined, and it has been assumed for this research that the presence of a goal is not necessary to conceptualize life as a journey. The use of this conceptual metaphor can be seen in contrasting the first paragraphs of the examples given to the control and experimental groups:

Control example passage (1st paragraph)

I was born on May 30, 1961 in Wisconsin. I was born there because my parents met at the University of Wisconsin. My father was studying geophysics and my mother was studying to become a nurse. However, I only lived in Wisconsin for 2 years because my father got a job in Washington D.C. as an oceanographer, working for the US Navy. So we moved to Clinton, Maryland, a small town outside of Washington D.C.

Experimental example passage

My journey began May 30, 1961 in Wisconsin because my parents met at the University of Wisconsin. My father studied geophysics and my mother studied nursing. However, the Wisconsin part of my journey was short, only 2 years because my father got a job in Washington D.C. as an oceanographer, working for the US Navy. So my life took a turn to Clinton, Maryland, a small town outside of Washington D.C.

As can be seen, it is the explicit mention of the 'journey', that gives the experimental passage a connection to the conceptual metaphor. We can also see that an ordinary phrase like 'my life took a turn' takes on added meaning when placed in the context of the conceptual metaphor.

3.1.2 Conceptual Metaphor 2

The first conceptual metaphor was explicitly presented to the students as an example, but the second conceptual metaphor was only given

as part of the two music videos and would fall in Grady's notion of a complex metaphor, built on several primary metaphors. An alternative description is Musolff (2006) and the notion of 'scenario', which captures the subdomain level of conceptual configurations in such metaphoric mappings. We can break this conceptual metaphor into several component parts and the first can be, as a first pass, described as TRUE FEELINGS ARE NOT PERFORMANCES. There is no conceptual metaphor in the literature dealing with truth, though it is clear that the notion TRUTH IS GOOD would appear to be a conceptual metaphor as the inverse is difficult to imagine, and as it is supported by the etymologies of true deriving from Old English *triewe* "faithful, trustworthy, honest". It would be expected that expressing the truth would be taken as preferable and we see this notion not only in English but in other Western cultures. For example, the word *hypocrite* derives from Greek *hypokrisis* "acting on the stage" with the word *hypokrites* being the technical term for a stage actor. Demosthenes attacked his rival Aeschines, who had been an actor before he became a politician, as a stage actor, implying that what he said was not his true feelings. (Duncan, 2006)

However, counter to this intuitive notion, it has been noted by several cultural researchers that Japanese society has a different valuing of the true expression of feelings. This difference is hinted at by the presence of the semantic pair *honne* and *tatemae*. (Lebra, 1976) *Honne* represents one's true emotions while *tatemae* indicates the standard that one must present in public view. Befu (1980) suggests that the *tatemae/honne* concepts are necessary to understand the outliers of group-oriented theories of Japanese behavior. Regardless which approach one takes, the opposition these terms create suggests that unlike in the West, the expression of false

feelings is not necessarily regarded as negative. This potentially undercuts the uptake and usage of the metaphor by Japanese students in the initial pedagogical task. This is actually preferable to having a metaphor that is deeply embedded in Japanese culture because it would be more difficult to separate what students produce as newly acquired and what is already there, waiting for them to access.

Another part of this metaphor may be described as ACTIONS WITHIN A PARTICULAR CONTEXT ARE CONTAINED IN A STAGE. In Ritchie (2013), he speaks of a 'stage' metaphor, giving examples such as 'the journalist's role in society' or someone 'hogging the spotlight', but gives no conceptual metaphor version, so one possible way of stating this as a conceptual metaphor would be ACTIONS WITHIN A PARTICULAR CONTEXT ARE CONTAINED IN A STAGE. Like TRUE FEELINGS ARE NOT PERFORMANCES, this conceptual metaphor has not been presented in the literature and added to that, a large number of potential mappings are created. By creating and presenting different materials to convey these potential mappings and then taking student writing output and observing what language that can be marked as metaphorical in nature, we can get some idea of what types of materials can best help students use these conceptual metaphors to organize their writing.

3.2 Initial Writing Prompt: Rihanna's *Take a Bow*

This metaphor is the basis for two assignments in the first part of this study, and students were asked to analyse two music videos that utilize this metaphor, Rihanna's 'Take a Bow' and Natalie Imbrugulia's 'Torn'.

In the Rihanna video of the song Take a Bow, an extended metaphor is presented comparing an unfaithful boyfriend to an actor playing a role.

Oh, How about a round of applause, Yeah
A standing ovation

The last part of the chorus, placed at the beginning of the song, hints at the extended metaphor, suggesting that the boyfriend needs to 'take a bow' for being such a good actor

You look so dumb right now
Standing outside my house
Trying to apologize
You're so ugly when you cry
Please, just cut it out
Don't tell me you're sorry 'cause you're not
Baby when I know you're only sorry you got caught

The first stanza presents the boyfriend, asking for forgiveness and so sets the target domain, that of a boyfriend who has cheated on the singer, who is narrating her feelings.

[Chorus]　But you put on quite a show
Really had me going
But now it's time to go
Curtain's finally closing
That was quite a show
Very entertaining
But it's over now (but it's over now)
Go on and take a bow

The chorus, which underlines the source domain, is that of an actor pretending to playing a role rather than a lover actually feeling love for the singer. The metaphor cluster includes terms such as 'put on a show', 'curtain is closing' and 'take a bow'.

Grab your clothes and get gone (get gone)
You better hurry up
Before the sprinklers come on (come on)
Talking 'bout'
Girl, I love you, you're the one
This just looks like a re-run
Please, what else is on (on)
Don't tell me you're sorry 'cause you're not
Baby when I know you're only sorry you got caught

This stanza primarily returns to the target domain, but a link to the source domain is highlighted with 'this just looks a re-run', implying that this 'performance' has been done before to other women. After this, the chorus is repeated

[Chorus]
[Bridge] Oh, And the award for
The best liar goes to you (goes to you)
For making me believe (that you)
That you could be faithful to me
Let's hear your speech, Oh

The bridge further extends the metaphor, using the phrase ‘And the award goes to...’ often heard at movie and theatre award shows, and asking for the ‘actor’ to give a speech. The song closes with a repeat of the chorus

The video alternates between Rihanna singing to the camera (though the lyrics are addressed to the unfaithful boyfriend rather than the listener) and footage illustrating the target domain. For the most part, the video emphasizes the target domain, though there are some gestures that the singer makes to reinforce points in the source domain. At 1:20, while singing but it’s over now, she looks at her watch, and at 2:15, the singer makes a gesture of curtains closing in synch with “Curtain’s finally closing” while at 2:25, she makes a small ‘goodbye’ gesture to synch with *But it’s over now*. At 2:55, the singer makes a gesture referred to colloquially as ‘talk to the hand’, where one’s hand imitates the actions of a mouth opening and closing. The usual use of this gesture is to indicate that the speaker is not interested in what the other person has to say, which is true (and would be part of the source domain), but it is timed to support the phrase “Let’s hear your speech”. Finally, at 3:35, the singer makes the gesture of taking a bow while singing the penultimate line *Go on and take a bow*. However, this visual presentation is by no means a clear presentation of the extended metaphor.

Students were asked to analyze the video as well as the lyrics of the song

3.3 Second Writing Prompt: Natalie Imbruglia’s *Torn*

The first part of this study was completed with a second music video that employs the same extended metaphor as the first, Natalie Imbrugulia’s Torn. However, unlike the Rihanna video, in this video, the use of the extended metaphor only appears in the visual presentation which is in the domain of the vehicle, a performance on stage. In the video, the singer

begins singing the song in an empty apartment, and, at the 0.17 mark, a man enters the apartment, and appears to be at home, leading to the conclusion that the two are romantically involved with enters the scene, an assumption that is reinforced when it appears that the man has a ring box and appears that he is about to propose to the women. However, before that can happen, at the 0:40 mark, a man appears from behind the camera and begins shifting the two actor's positions around, changing the assumption that the relationship of the singer and the man have is actually for some sort of film, and their intimacy is only a performance for the camera. This allows the lyrics to be read as representing the first extended metaphor, despite the fact that there are no clear cut lexical items or phrases to mark it as such. After having had an opportunity to structure their longer form writing around this extended metaphor and then having an opportunity to work with a more universal conceptual metaphor, the question is will students show increased awareness of the metaphor when it is not part of the linguistic material of the song. Both of these videos will be examined more closely for visual aspects as following Ortiz (2011).

This design is designed to deal with a challenge linguistics generally faces, and one that is particularly challenging for metaphor research, in that it is not possible to adduce the actual thought processes of the speaker/user. This challenge is further heightened when the subjects are, as in this study, non-native speakers working to acquire the language. When a student uses a metaphor, it is possible that they are not processing it metaphorically, but only as a cipher for something in their own language that may or may not be metaphorical. While this study does not completely solve or avoid the problem, it does attempt to prime the metaphorical production in a different way than other work that has been

proposed in the literature. It also seeks to create both a range of materials and a set of topics that would allow all or part of the research to be replicated in other classrooms and other cultures.

4.0 The quantitative study

As the goal of this research is to determine how students can be induced to produce extended metaphor, this portion of the research was primarily aimed at first testing the preliminary research question which is '*how and to what extent does exposure to one conceptual metaphor increase awareness of other conceptual metaphors?*' through a quasi experimental design. This was done to determine if the set up and delivery of the assignment was able to induce the identification and manipulation of those conceptual metaphors in a way that could be compared to a multimodal analysis of the videos, as well as providing qualitative data on student production of metaphor in assignments where metaphor production was an explicit aim of the assignment.

4.1 Participants

A total of 23 native Japanese EFL university students participated in the first part of this study, consisting of two writing classes at Japanese public university English department. All were 2nd year students with at least 7 years of English student (6 years secondary school, 1 year university) and, as with the majority of Japanese EFL students (cf. Miura, 1995; Hirose, 1998), and had not received any formal instruction in longer form essay writing, with the bulk of their instruction in 'composition', limited to sentence level translation from Japanese to English. The course was the 2nd year, first term required course for the introduction of academic writing, with the first course, conducted in the second half of their 1st year, concentrating on improving sentence level accuracy. The course met weekly for 15 weeks

and the first class of 11 students was treated as the control group and was taught by a Japanese part time teacher, while a second class of 12 students was the experimental group, taught by the author.

4.2 Method

Each group was asked, as their initial assignment, to write a self introduction in the last 30 minutes of the class. The control group was asked to write their self introduction utilizing a standard Introduction-Body-Conclusion format while the experimental group was asked to organize their essay along the lines of the conceptual metaphor discussed in section 3.1.1, LIFE IS A JOURNEY. This was briefly introduced by having the experimental group reflect on and generate vocabulary for three different types of journeys, by train, by bus or car and on foot, and use those types of journeys to organize their ideas. No explicit mention was made of notions of conceptual metaphor to the experimental group and the presentation was limited in scope, so much so that one student described the route from their home to their high school rather than conceptualizing their life as a journey.

For the following class period, the essays were corrected for low-level grammatical errors and returned, and the two groups were asked to listen to and then watch the music video of Rihanna's song *Take a Bow*, which incorporates the conceptual metaphor discussed in the section 3.1.2. After this, the students were asked to write an essay explaining the lyrics and video and were given 30 minutes of class time to begin a 1-page essay and were asked to complete their essays before the next class. No mention was made of metaphor, and students were instructed to simply explain the lyrics and video.

As with the introduction essays, the number of sentences was determined and the number of sentences that specifically referenced metaphoric content

of the song lyrics was calculated, with the number of sentences that referenced metaphoric content divided by the total number of sentences to yield a figure that conceivably reflected the noticing of metaphoric content and the control and experimental group were compared.

In the following class period, students were assigned a second video, Natalie Imbruglia's *Torn*, which incorporates the same conceptual metaphor as the Rihanna song but only via the visual, with the same procedure. It should be noted that explicit instruction in metaphor or conceptual metaphor theory was avoided for this initial portion of the pilot in order to gauge the effects of the presented metaphors.

4.3 Results

The two groups produced comparable initial essays in terms of words and sentences. The total number of words per assignment (control mean=108, control mean=100; experimental mean=140, median=136) and total number of clauses (control mean=11.2, mean=12; experimental mean=13.3, median=13.5) is slightly weighted towards the experimental group, suggesting that because of the novelty of the experimental condition and the difficulty of utilizing an intro-body-conclusion for the control, the experimental group may have been encouraged to be more productive.

Because of the small number of participants (n=23), a Wilconcox Signed Rank Statistic was determined for the first and second essays with the null hypothesis being:

There is no statistical difference between the metaphoric production of the group that was assigned a standard self-introduction and the group that was asked to organize their self-introduction around the conceptual metaphor LIFE IS A JOURNEY.

The alternative hypothesis was:

The metaphoric production of the group that was asked to organize their self-introduction around the conceptual metaphor LIFE IS A JOURNEY is systematically higher than the metaphoric production of the group assigned a standard self-introduction.

For the initial essay, the difference was not significant (V= 35.5; p = 0.06464), so there was only roughly a 94% certainty that the presentation of the conceptual metaphor LIFE IS A JOURNEY had an impact on student awareness of the second conceptual metaphor, as measured through their production of descriptive essays. One confounding variable was the potential lack of uptake by some of the students in the experimental group who did not incorporate the LIFE IS A JOURNEY metaphor in their essay, which may have diminished any effect that the introduction of the metaphor might have had. A second was the fact that the first music video only presented the conceptual metaphor as part of the lyrics rather than any reinforcement through the visual mode.

Assuming the same hypotheses for the second essay, the result of the Wilconcox Signed Rank test is V= 24.5; p = 0.03912 or a 96% certainty, which is statistically significant. A potential confounding variable was the order of the video prompts, in that students may have picked up on the LIFE IS A STAGE metaphor from the first video.

An effect size analysis reveals that Cohen's *d* for the first essay is 0.649, signifying a large effect size magnitude while for Pearson's *r*, it is 0.308, suggesting a medium effect size magnitude. For the second essay, Cohen's *d* is 1.0169, signifying a large effect size magnitude while for Pearson's *r*, it is 0.453, again suggesting a medium effect size magnitude. This is in line with the potential inflation of Cohen's *d* due to small sample size. (cf Cohen, 1992)

Obviously, the first video task would influence the second essay and students, rather than only being sensitized to the LIFE IS A JOURNEY metaphor, are given exposure to the target metaphor. However, if there were little or no influence from the presentation of LIFE IS A JOURNEY, we would expect no statistically significant effect for the second video as well. This raises the possibility that presentation of metaphor as prompts creates a 'Matthew effect' (originally Merton, 1968, for application in reading literacy, see Stanovich, 1986) in that presentation of metaphor increases sensitivity to metaphor, which results in a further scaffolding of awareness.

4.4 Qualitative analysis

It may seem contradictory that this preliminary portion of the research makes no explicit mention of metaphor while I have argued previously that L2 learner data has suffered from the absence of L2 production that has as a goal the use of metaphor and encourages learners to employ figurative language. However, in order to create an experimental framework, it was felt necessary to remove the explicit explanation of metaphor and encouragement to produce figurative language in order to establish the parameters of the project. Explicitly encouraging one group to produce metaphor by devoting classroom time to a discussion of metaphor and how it appears in English writing would be pedagogically sound, but would also beg the question of whether metaphor is something that can be usefully induced in student output as we would expect that if students were taught metaphor, they would produce it in their essays. Given that there was some statistical significance involved in the implicit presentation of metaphor and its impact on student writing in addition to a large effect size even among relatively low level learners, this then sets the stage for exploration of the explicit presentation of metaphor through multimodal prompts. A qualitative

analysis supports this by revealing striking language use and a greater grasp of the embedded metaphor in both groups and in the experimental group in particular. More precisely, a qualitative analysis of the data from the first writing prompt shows the experimental group actively using figurative language to explain the content of the song. For example:

" *There are many scene that Rihanna sings alone and the man don't often appear. I think that means the man is disappearing in her heart*"

" *I think that Rihanna's inner voice is about to blow up, and she seems to get angry halfway.*"

Her feeling is so bad now, so she don't hear her boyfriend's explanation and she saying him that close your show. It mean is "please, part from me and don't meet to me forever"

The last example is significant because the student has attempted to identify the metaphor embedded in the song, and uses quotation marks to present the feelings of the singer, utilizing words that are not in the lyrics. This suggests that the student is focusing on aspects of the singer's mental state that are not overtly stated in the lyrics.

Perhaps the best explanation of the metaphor was this student from the experimental group:

As you know, the title of the song is a take a bow, it means finish. She compare life with her boyfriend to a show, and say show was very entertaining but it has finished now, so you should take a bow to the audience.

While there are obvious errors of grammar and style, the student has identified the metaphor and explained it. We can contrast this explanation with this from a control group student:

"*and the award for the best liar goes to you for making me believe that you could be faithful to me let's hear your speech how about a round of applause? Standing*

ovation" I regarded this part is irony to the boyfriend.

While the student in the experimental group breaks down the metaphor to discuss its component parts, the control group student quotes the lyrics and identifies that passage in isolation as 'irony'.

This is not to claim that the control group failed to identify the metaphoric content and write about it. Another control group student wrote:

Her romance is likened to a show and it's the end part of show in this song.

This sentence clearly indicates that the student understands the metaphor that is being expressed in the song. Furthermore, a student in the experimental group wrote:

It was difficult to understand that she compares her boyfriend's lie to the show of a stage.

And I could not see "this just looks like a re-run."

However, the experimental group more generally were able to identify and utilize the metaphoric content in a way that assisted them in writing their essays.

Throughout all the student essays were striking turns of phrases, pointing to the efficacy of multimodal prompts. Some are listed below:

Because the melody is too dark to insult someone who left her.

That her sad feelings was showed on black wall of the video's background when she sings.

I'd like to understand difficult expressions to grab the meaning of English songs.

I can't get to know concretely what he did from this lyrics.

While it might be that it is not the metaphoric content in the video specifically, but both the content which students can relate to and the obvious interest that the students have in pop culture that induces this language, it is striking that these examples of figurative language arise

from this prompt.

5.0 Conclusion

Because this initial research suggests the possibility that the presentation of conceptual metaphors through multimodal prompts can increase the production of figurative language, further research will be to determine what aspects of multimodal prompts can induce figurative language and how classroom instruction can reinforce and emphasize this aspect of student writing. This preliminary research suggests that representations of metaphor in the visual mode have an impact on student production, which reiterate work in computer assisted language learning of the usefulness of multimedia for presentation content to L2 learners.

If the presentation of writing prompts can induce the production of figurative language in L2 students, the next step is to attempt to determine what combination of explicit teaching and writing prompts can best create conditions for students to incorporate more figurative language in their writing. This is a key issue because the general pattern has been to present metaphor as a topic for advanced learners, only to be tackled after mastering the basics of grammar and vocabulary, which students only being presented with notion of metaphor after they are able to produce relatively error-free English. Hinkle (2011) gives a list of “Micro features” of vocabulary and writing in L2 writing that include the following points:

- exhibit less lexical variety and sophistication;
- contain significantly fewer idiomatic and collocational expressions;
- have smaller lexical density and lexical specificity, and more frequent vocabulary misuses;
- fewer passive constructions;

・markedly fewer of abstract and interpretive nouns, and nominalizations (e.g., rotation, cognition, analysis)

However, this research, while only a single study, suggests that students are more likely to produce striking collocations, which indicates that the prompts that incorporate metaphor can provide a key component in advancing writing fluency.

One may raise the question of whether these effects are simply because of the presentation of the video prompt, but the design of the experiment and its statistical significance, argues for presenting students with further opportunities to structure their writing not along process writing dictums of introduction-body-conclusion, but as essays built up around conceptual metaphors would challenge students in ways that traditional process writing do not. Further classroom work has been to identify and trial such topics with students. It is likely, if not obvious, that the initial presentation of metaphor, even if it did create an initial uptick in the production of figurative language, would not be able support further gains, so the question of delaying the writing task to determine precisely what aspect of the prompts is responsible for the increased production of such language, which was raised by one reviewer, is not a very logical one. If the presentation of two metaphors without explicit instruction can induce students to produce figurative language, the challenge should not be to determine what is the minimum level of metaphor that can function as a catalyst but how to provide more support. For example, more detailed instruction into how to write one's life as a journey would be a first step. Other essays, such as describing one's college career as a sport match or making explicit metaphoric explanations of people and events in the learners life, in addition to the use of prompts containing metaphor is a

much more logical research strategy.

Befu, H. (1980). The group model of Japanese society and an alternative. *Rice University Studies*, 66, pp. 169-187.

Boers, F, Eyckmans, J. and Stengers, H. (2007) Presenting figurative idioms with a touch of etymology: More than mere mnemonics? *Language Teaching Research*. 11:1. pp. 43-62.

Boers, F. (2000). Metaphor awareness and vocabulary retention. *Applied Linguistics* 21:4. pp. 553-571.

Boers, F. and Demecheleer, M. (1998). A cognitive semantic approach to teaching prepositions. *English Language Teaching Journal*. 52:3. pp. 197-204.

Cameron, L. (1999). Identifying and describing metaphor. In L. Cameron & G. D. Low (eds.). *Researching and applying metaphor*, pp. 105-132

Cameron, L.J. & Stelma, J.H. (2007). Metaphor clusters in discourse. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 1(2). pp. 107–136.

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. Psychological Bulletin, 112, 155-159. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155

Deignan, A. (2003). Metaphorical Expressions and Culture: An Indirect Link. *Metaphor and Symbol*. 18(4). pp. 255–271.

Deignan, A., Gabrys, D. & Solska, A. (1997). Teaching English metaphors using cross-linguistic awareness-raising activities. *English Language Teaching Journal*. 51:4. 352-360.

Dong, Yu Ren (2004) Don't keep them in the dark! Teaching metaphors to English language learners. *English Journal*. 93:4. 29-35.

Duncan, A. (2006). *Performance and identity in the classical world*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Evans, V. (2013). Language and time: a cognitive linguistics approach. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Fillmore, C. (1982). Frame semantics. In The Linguistic Society of Korea (ed). *Linguistics*

in the Morning Calm. pp. 111-137. Seoul: Hanshin.

Gentner, D., Falkenhainer, B., & Skorstad, J. (1987). Metaphor: The good, the bad and the ugly. *Proceedings of the Third Conference on Theoretical Issues in Natural Language Processing*. pp. 155-159.

Gerrig, R.J. & Gibbs, R.W. (1988). Beyond the Lexicon: Creativity in Language Production. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*. 3(3), pp. 1–19.

Grady, J.E., 1997. *Foundations of Meaning: Primary Metaphors and Primary Scenes*. PhD. Dissertation. University of California, Berkeley.

Haspelmath, Martin. (1997). *From space to time: Temporal adverbials in the world's languages*. München: Lincom Europa.

Hinkel, E., 2011. What research on second language writing tells us and what it doesn't. In Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning Volume 2. New York: Routledge, pp. 523–538.

Hirose, K. (1998). The effects of English paragraph writing instruction on Japanese university students. *JACET Bulletin*. 29. pp. 51–64.

Holme, R. (2004). Mind, metaphor and language teaching. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jewitt, C. (2009). *The Routledge handbook of multimodal analysis*. London: Routledge.

Kachru, B. (1992). World Englishes: approaches, issues and resources. *Language Teaching* 25. pp. 1-14.

Kathpalia, S. S., & Carmel, H. L. H. (2011). Metaphorical Competence in ESL Student Writing. *RELC Journal*. 42(3). pp. 273–290.

Kalyuga, M., & Kalyuga, S. (2008). Metaphor awareness in teaching vocabulary. *Language Learning Journal*. 36(2). pp. 249–257.

Kövecses, Z. (1990). *Emotion concepts*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Kövecses, Z. (2000). *Metaphor and Emotion*. New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kövecses, Zoltán. (1995). Anger: Its language, conceptualization, and physiology in the

light of cross-cultural evidence. In J. R. Taylor and R. MacLaury (eds.) *Language and the Cognitive Construal of the World*. 181-196. Berlin: Mouton.

Kress, G.R. & Leeuwen, T. Van. (2000). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design*. 2nd ed., London: Routledge.

Langacker, R. (1987). *Foundations of cognitive grammar*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Lebra, T. S. (1976). *Japanese Patterns of Behavior*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, fire, and dangerous things: what categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. & Kövecses, Z. (1987). The Cognitive Models of Anger Inherent in American English. In D. Holland and N. Quinn (eds). *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*. pp. 195–221.

Lakoff, G. & Turner, M., (1999). *Philosophy In The Flesh: the Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books.

Littlemore, J. (2001). An empirical study of the relationship between cognitive style and the use of communication strategy. *Applied Linguistics*. 22(2). pp. 241–265.

Littlemore, J., 2003. The effect of cultural background on metaphor interpretation. *Metaphor and symbol*, 18(4), pp. 273–288.

Littlemore, J. (2010). *Applying Cognitive Linguistics to L2 Learning and Teaching*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Littlemore, J. (2012). The role of metaphor and metonymy in EFL proficiency. *The Language Teacher*. 36(4). pp. 15-17.

Littlemore, J., & Low, G. (2006). Metaphoric Competence, Second Language Learning, and Communicative Language Ability. Applied Linguistics, 27(2). pp. 268–294.

Low, G. D. (2008). Metaphor and positioning in academic book reviews in Zanotto, M., Cameron, L. & Cavalcanti, M. (eds.). *Confronting metaphor in use: An applied linguistic*

approach. pp. 79-100. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

MacArthur, F. (2010). Metaphorical competence in EFL: Where are we and where should we be going? A view from the language classroom. *AILA Review*. 23. pp. 155–173.

Merton, R. K. (1968). The Matthew Effect in Science. *Science* 159(3810) pp. 56–63.

Miura, J. (1995). *Writing no gijutsu 2: Kurisutensen mesoddo* [Writing skills 2: Christensen method]. Eigo Kyoiku, 44, pp. 34-36.

Musolff, A. (2004). *Metaphor and Political Discourse: Analogical Reasoning in Debates about Europe*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Musolff, A. (2006) Metaphor scenarios in public discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*. 21:1. 23-38.

Musolff, A. (2012). The study of metaphor as part of critical discourse analysis. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 37–41.

Nacey, S. (2013). *Metaphors in learner English*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Ortiz, Maria J. (2011). Primary Metaphors and Monomodal Visual Metaphors. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 43: 1568-1580.

Ortony, A., (1979/1993). *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pullum, G. K., & Scholz, B. C. (2002). Empirical assessment of stimulus poverty arguments. The Linguistic Review, 18(1-2), 9–50.

Reddy, M. (1979/1993). The Conduit Metaphor. In A. Ortony. (ed.). *Metaphor and Thought*. (pp. 164-201). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards. I. A. (1936). *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. Oxford, Oxford University. Press.

Ritchie, L. D. (2013). *Metaphor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schön, D. (1993). Generative metaphor: A perspective on problem-setting in social policy In A. Ortony. (ed.). *Metaphor and Thought*. (pp. 137-163) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stanovich, K. E. (1986). Matthew Effects in Reading: Some Consequences of Individual Differences in the Acquisition of Literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*. 21(4). pp. 360–407.

Steen, G. J., Biernacka, E., Alleta, D. G., Kaal, A. A., Lopez-Rodrigoues, I., & Pasma, T. (2010). Pragglejaz in practice. In G. Low et al., eds. *Researching and applying metaphor in the real world*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. (pp. 165–184).

Talmy, L. (2000). *Toward a Cognitive Semantics, volume I: Concept structuring systems*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Yu, N. (1995). Metaphorical Expressions of Anger and Happiness in English and Chinese. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*. 10:2. pp. 59-92.

Music videos used

Rihanna. "Take a Bow". Online video clip. Uploaded 20 Nov 2009. Retrieved from 〈https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=J3UjJ4wKLkg〉.

Imbruglia, Natalie. "Torn Online video clip. Uploaded 2 Oct 2009.
Retrieved from 〈https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VV1XWJN3nJo〉.